United Nations A/57/333

General Assembly

Distr.: General
21 August 2002

Original: English

Fifty-seventh session
Item 109 of the provisional agenda*
Elimination of racism and racial discrimination

Financial situation of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

Report of the Secretary-General**

1. Pursuant to article 8, paragraph 6, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex), States parties shall be responsible for the expenses of the members of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination while they are in performance of Committee duties.

2. The General Assembly, by resolution 47/111 of 16 December 1992, welcomed the decision taken at the Fourteenth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention in January 1992 to amend article 8 of the Convention, and requested the Secretary-General to take the appropriate measures to provide for the financing of the Committee from the regular budget of the United Nations, beginning with the budget for the biennium 1994-1995, and to take the necessary measures to ensure that the Committee meets as scheduled until the amendment entered into force.

3. Acting in his capacity as depositary, the Secretary-General communicated the amendment to all States parties on 1 March 1993 (see annex I). It will be recalled that, at their Fourteenth Meeting, the States parties had decided that the amendment would enter into force when accepted by a two-thirds majority of States parties which had so notified the Secretary-General as depositary. As at 1 July 2002, notifications of acceptance had been received from 33 States parties to the Convention.

4. By resolution 55/81 of 4 December 2000, the Assembly strongly urged States parties to the Convention to accelerate their domestic ratification procedures with regard to the amendment to the Convention concerning the financing of the Committee and to notify the Secretary-General expeditiously in writing of their agreement to the above-mentioned amendment. Further, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to ensure adequate financial arrangements and to provide the necessary support, including an adequate level of Secretariat assistance, in order to ensure the functioning of the Committee and to enable it to cope with its increasing amount of work, and to invite those States parties that were in arrears to pay the amounts in arrears, and to report thereon to the Assembly at its fifty-seventh session.

5. Financing for the annual sessions of the Committee in 2001 and 2002 was provided from the regular budget, in accordance with Assembly resolution 47/111. Consequently, no State party assessments were made in those two years. However, a number of States parties are still in arrears in the light of the non-payment of previous assessments. As at 1 July 2002, the total arrears outstanding amounted to $172,042.58 (see annex II).

* A/57/150.

** This document is submitted late so as to include the most up-to-date information possible.

02-53279 (E) 180902

Annex I

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: approval by the General Assembly of the proposed amendment to article 8

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, acting in his capacity as depositary, and with reference to depositary notification C.N.285.1991.TREATIES-4 of 20 December 1991, communicates the following:

2. It will be recalled that the States parties to the above-mentioned Convention, at the twenty-second meeting of the Fourteenth Meeting of the States Parties, held on 15 January 1992, decided as follows:

> "1. To replace paragraph 6 of article 8 of the Convention with the paragraph 'The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall provide the necessary staff and facilities for the effective performance of the functions of the Committee under the Convention';
>
> "2. To add a new paragraph, as article 8, paragraph 7, as follows:
>
> 'The members of the Committee established under the present Convention shall, with the approval of the General Assembly, receive emoluments from United Nations resources on such terms and conditions as the General Assembly may decide';
>
> "...
>
> "4. That the amendment shall enter into force when it has been approved by the General Assembly and accepted by a two-thirds majority of States parties which shall have so notified the Secretary-General as depositary."

3. The General Assembly endorsed the amendment at its forty-seventh session (resolution 47/111 of 16 December 1992). In accordance with the above-quoted paragraph 4, it will enter into force when it is accepted by the required number of States parties which shall have so notified the Secretary-General.

Annex II

Status of contributions to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination as at 1 July 2002

(United States dollars)

State party	*Contributions payable as at 31 January 1993*	*1993 assessments*	*Total collections from 1993 to 2002 for 1993 and prior years*[a]	*Contributions payable as at 1 July 2002*
Afghanistan	1 348.00	877.00	--	2 225.00
Algeria	--	1 177.00	1 177.00	--
Antigua and Barbuda	--	877.00	877.00	--
Argentina	690.00	1 941.00	2 631.00	--
Australia	--	3 811.00	3 811.00	--
Austria	--	2 341.00	2 341.00	--
Bahamas	--	896.00	896.00	--
Bahrain	--	920.00	920.00	--
Bangladesh	876.00	877.00	1 753.00	--
Barbados	362.00	877.00	1 239.00	--
Belarus	1 426.00	1 869.00	--	3 295.00
Belgium	--	2 900.00	2 900.00	--
Bolivia	362.00	877.00	--	1 239.00
Botswana	--	877.00	877.00	--
Brazil	1 792.00	4 056.00	5 848.00	--
Bulgaria	431.00	1 104.00	1 535.00	--
Burkina Faso	6 629.83	877.00	--	7 506.83
Burundi	8 899.00	877.00	--	9 776.00
Cambodia	2 244.00	877.00	--	3 121.00
Cameroon	942.04	877.00	--	1 819.04
Canada	7 004.00	--	7 004.00	--
Cape Verde	7 162.00	877.00	--	8 039.00
Central African Republic	7 783.89	877.00	--	8 660.89
Chad	211.40	877.00	--	1 088.40
Chile	1 006.00	1 015.00	2 021.00	--
China	--	2 367.00	2 367.00	--
Colombia	(0.09)	1 109.00	1 109.00	(0.09)
Congo	2 597.00	877.00	--	3 474.00
Costa Rica	3 888.86	872.00	4 867.88	(107.02)
Côte d'Ivoire	1 937.00	896.00	2 813.34	19.66
Cuba	--	1 035.00	1 035.00	--
Cyprus	--	896.00	896.00	--
Czech Republic[b]	--	(502.00)	--	(502.00)
Democratic Republic of the Congo[c]	(45.00)	877.00	--	832.00

State party	Contributions payable as at 31 January 1993	1993 assessments	Total collections from 1993 to 2002 for 1993 and prior years[a]	Contributions payable as at 1 July 2002
Denmark	--	2 122.00	2 122.00	--
Dominican Republic	3 523.00	892.00	--	4 415.00
Ecuador	913.00	916.00	1 829.00	--
Egypt	--	994.00	994.00	--
El Salvador	7 162.00	877.00	--	8 039.00
Estonia	--	1 205.00	--	1 205.00
Ethiopia	(514.00)	877.00	363.00	--
Fiji	362.00	877.00	1 239.00	--
Finland	--	2 007.00	2 007.00	--
France	--	12 590.00	12 590.00	--
Gabon	892.00	892.00	--	1 784.00
Gambia	7 831.00	877.00	--	8 708.00
Germany	--	18 294.00	18 294.00	--
Ghana	--	877.00	877.00	--
Greece	--	1 524.00	1 524.00	--
Guatemala	1 389.20	896.00	2 285.20	--
Guinea	903.80	877.00	--	1 780.80
Guyana	--	877.00	877.00	--
Haiti	1 750.00	877.00	--	2 627.00
Holy See	--	877.00	877.00	--
Hungary	--	1 199.00	1 199.00	--
Iceland	--	916.00	916.00	--
India	--	1 562.00	1 562.00	--
Iran, Islamic Republic of	--	2 411.00	2 411.00	--
Iraq	(248.92)	1 117.00	868.08	--
Israel	1 949.00	1 320.00	3 269.00	--
Italy	(1.00)	9 456.00	9 456.00	(1.00)
Jamaica	362.00	877.00	1 239.00	--
Jordan	--	877.00	877.00	--
Kuwait	501.00	1 332.00	1 833.00	--
Lao People's Democratic Republic	--	877.00	877.00	--
Latvia	--	1 322.00	1 322.00	--
Lebanon	4 822.00	877.00	5 699.00	--
Lesotho	1 348.00	877.00	2 225.00	--
Liberia	7 139.00	877.00	--	8 016.00
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	2 053.00	1 313.00	3 366.00	--
Luxembourg	--	975.00	975.00	--
Madagascar	901.87	877.00	--	1 778.87
Maldives	--	877.00	877.00	--

State party	*Contributions payable as at 31 January 1993*	*1993 assessments*	*Total collections from 1993 to 2002 for 1993 and prior years[a]*	*Contributions payable as at 1 July 2002*
Mali	9 850.00	877.00	--	10 727.00
Malta	--	877.00	877.00	--
Mauritania	2 285.00	877.00	--	3 162.00
Mauritius	--	877.00	877.00	--
Mexico	--	2 567.00	2 567.00	--
Mongolia	876.00	877.00	--	1 753.00
Morocco	--	912.00	912.00	--
Mozambique	5 097.00	877.00	--	5 974.00
Nepal	876.00	877.00	1 753.00	--
Netherlands	--	3 750.00	3 750.00	--
New Zealand	--	1 331.00	1 331.00	--
Nicaragua	2 244.00	877.00	--	3 121.00
Niger	2 750.00	877.00	--	3 627.00
Nigeria	1 899.00	1 251.00	3 150.00	--
Norway	(15.00)	1 941.00	1 926.00	--
Pakistan	0.01	975.00	975.01	--
Panama	1 122.00	896.00	2 018.00	--
Papua New Guinea	362.00	877.00	--	1 239.00
Peru	2 469.00	975.00	3 444.00	--
Philippines	(211.11)	986.00	774.89	--
Poland	610.00	1 744.00	2 354.00	--
Portugal	--	1 260.00	1 260.00	--
Qatar	393.00	955.00	1 348.00	--
Republic of Korea	--	2 425.00	2 425.00	--
Romania	1 819.00	1 184.00	3 003.00	--
Russian Federation	18 149.00	12 750.00	30 899.00	--
Rwanda	876.00	877.00	--	1 753.00
Saint Lucia	--	877.00	877.00	--
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	6 637.00	877.00	--	7 514.00
Senegal	(816.19)	877.00	--	60.81
Seychelles	876.00	877.00	666.14	1 086.86
Sierra Leone	8 659.00	877.00	--	9 536.00
Slovenia	--	1 205.00	1 205.00	--
Solomon Islands	2 244.00	877.00	3 121.00	--
Somalia	7 028.00	877.00	--	7 905.00
Spain	--	4 777.00	4 777.00	--
Sri Lanka	--	877.00	877.00	--
Sudan	3 510.00	877.00	--	4 387.00
Suriname	3 084.00	877.00	3 961.00	--

State party	*Contributions payable as at 31 January 1993*	*1993 assessments*	*Total collections from 1993 to 2002 for 1993 and prior years*[a]	*Contributions payable as at 1 July 2002*
Swaziland	362.00	877.00	1 239.00	--
Sweden	--	3 003.00	3 003.00	--
Syrian Arab Republic	385.00	936.00	1 321.00	--
Togo	1 367.04	877.00	--	2 244.04
Tonga	798.00	877.00	--	1 675.00
Trinidad and Tobago	820.17	955.00	1 775.17	--
Tunisia	--	916.00	916.00	--
Uganda	362.00	877.00	--	1 239.00
Ukraine	3 026.00	4 820.00	7 846.00	--
United Arab Emirates	--	1 280.00	1 280.00	--
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	--	10 836.00	10 836.00	--
United Republic of Tanzania	1 898.00	877.00	--	2 775.00
Uruguay	385.00	936.00	1 321.00	--
Venezuela	--	1 788.00	2 933.47	(1 145.47)
Viet Nam	2 244.00	877.00	--	3 121.00
Yemen	924.00	877.00	--	1 801.00
Zambia	(2 146.88)	877.00	201.40	(1 471.28)
Zimbabwe	993.00	1 093.00	--	2 086.00
Total[d]	**202 667.60**	**216 906.00**	**247 197.94**[c]	**169 467.58**

[a] In accordance with records of the Contributions Service as at 1 July 2002.

[b] An amount of $502.00, which represents the surplus of the 1991 contribution made by the former Czechoslovakia, has been placed in suspense pending action, if any, by the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

[c] The former Zaire was renamed Democratic Republic of the Congo effective 17 May 1997.

[d] Contributions of $1,453 were payable by the former Yugoslavia as at 31 January 1993. The former Yugoslavia was assessed in 1993 for a contribution of $1,122. No monies have been collected from the former Yugoslavia in or after 1993 in respect of its 1993 and prior assessments. The unpaid contributions of the former Yugoslavia therefore total $2,575.

[e] Includes credits held in suspense account, totalling $3,226.86 in favour of six States parties.

United Nations A/57/334

General Assembly

Distr.: General
22 August 2002

Original: English

Fifty-seventh session
Item 109 of the provisional agenda*
Elimination of racism and racial discrimination

Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

Report of the Secretary-General**

1. The General Assembly, by its resolution 2106 A (XX) of 21 December 1965, adopted and opened for signature and ratification the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and invited the States referred to in article 17 of the Convention to sign and ratify it without delay. In the same resolution, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit to it reports concerning the state of ratifications of the Convention, which would be considered by the Assembly at future sessions.

2. In its resolution 55/81 of 4 December 2000, section III, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the Convention (A/55/203); reaffirmed once again its conviction that ratification of or accession to the Convention on a universal basis and the implementation of its provisions were necessary for the realization of the objectives of the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and for action beyond the Decade; urged all States that had not yet become parties to the Convention to ratify it or accede thereto as soon as possible, bearing in mind the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, held in South Africa from 31 August to 8 September 2001; requested the States parties to the Convention that had not yet done so to consider the possibility of making the declaration provided for in article 14 of the Convention; and decided to consider at its fifty-seventh session the report of the Secretary-General concerning the status of the Convention.

3. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was opened for signature in New York on 7 March 1966. It entered into force on 4 January 1969, on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the twenty-seventh instrument of ratification, as provided for in article 19 of the Convention.

* A/57/150.
** This document was submitted late so as to include the most up-to-date information possible.

02-53267 (E) 200902

4. As of 1 July 2002, the Convention had been ratified or acceded to by 162 States parties. The list of States that had signed, ratified, acceded or succeeded to the Convention, and the dates of their signatures, ratifications, accessions or successions are contained in the annex to the present report.

5. As of the same date, 41 of the States parties to the Convention — namely, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uruguay and Yugoslavia — had made the declaration provided for under article 14 of the Convention, recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within their jurisdiction claiming to be victims of violation by those States parties of any of the rights set forth in the Convention. The provisions of article 14 entered into force on 3 December 1982, in accordance with paragraph 9 of that article.

6. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination normally holds two regular sessions annually of three weeks' duration each. In accordance with article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Committee is to submit, through the Secretary-General, an annual report to the General Assembly. The report to be submitted to the Assembly at its present session (A/57/18) covers the activities of the Committee at its sixtieth and sixty-first sessions.

Annex

States parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as at 1 July 2002

State party	*Date of receipt of the instrument of ratification or accession*	*Entry into force*
Afghanistan	6 July 1983[a]	5 August 1983
Albania	11 May 1994[a]	10 June 1994
Algeria	14 February 1972	15 March 1972
Antigua and Barbuda	25 October 1988[a]	24 November 1988
Argentina	2 October 1968	4 January 1969
Armenia	23 June 1993[a]	23 July 1993
Australia	30 September 1975	30 October 1975
Austria	9 May 1972	8 June 1972
Azerbaijan	16 August 1996[a]	15 September 1996
Bahamas	5 August 1975[b]	4 September 1975
Bahrain	27 March 1990[a]	26 April 1990
Bangladesh	11 June 1979[a]	11 July 1979
Barbados	8 November 1972[a]	8 December 1972
Belarus	8 April 1969	8 May 1969
Belgium	7 August 1975	6 September 1975
Belize	14 November 2001	13 December 2001
Benin	30 November 2001	29 December 2001
Bolivia	22 September 1970	22 October 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina	16 July 1993[b]	16 July 1993
Botswana	20 February 1974[a]	22 March 1974
Brazil	27 March 1968	4 January 1969
Bulgaria	8 August 1966	4 January 1969

State party	*Date of receipt of the instrument of ratification or accession*	*Entry into force*
Burkina Faso	18 July 1974[a]	17 August 1974
Burundi	27 October 1977	26 November 1977
Cambodia	28 November 1983	28 December 1983
Cameroon	24 June 1971	24 July 1971
Canada	14 October 1970	13 November 1970
Cape Verde	3 October 1979[a]	2 November 1979
Central African Republic	16 March 1971	15 April 1971
Chad	17 August 1977[a]	16 September 1977
Chile	20 October 1971	19 November 1971
China	29 December 1981[a]	28 January 1982
Colombia	2 September 1981	2 October 1981
Congo	11 July 1988[a]	10 August 1988
Costa Rica	16 January 1967	4 January 1969
Côte d'Ivoire	4 January 1973[a]	3 February 1973
Croatia	12 October 1992[b]	12 October 1992
Cuba	15 February 1972	16 March 1972
Cyprus	21 April 1967	4 January 1969
Czech Republic	22 February 1993[b]	22 February 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	21 April 1976[a]	21 May 1976
Denmark	9 December 1971	8 January 1972
Dominican Republic	25 May 1983[a]	24 June 1983
Ecuador	22 September 1966[a]	4 January 1969
Egypt	1 May 1967	4 January 1969
El Salvador	30 November 1979[a]	30 December 1979
Eritrea	31 July 2001[a]	29 August 2001
Estonia	21 October 1991[a]	20 November 1991

State party	*Date of receipt of the instrument of ratification or accession*	*Entry into force*
Ethiopia	23 June 1976[a]	23 July 1976
Fiji	11 January 1973[b]	10 February 1973
Finland	14 July 1970	13 August 1970
France	28 July 1971[a]	27 August 1971
Gabon	29 February 1980	30 March 1980
Gambia	29 December 1978[a]	28 January 1979
Georgia	2 June 1999[a]	2 July 1999
Germany	16 May 1969	15 June 1969
Ghana	8 September 1966	4 January 1969
Greece	18 June 1970	18 July 1970
Guatemala	18 January 1983	17 February 1983
Guinea	14 March 1977	13 April 1977
Guyana	15 February 1977	17 March 1977
Haiti	19 December 1972	18 January 1973
Holy See	1 May 1969	31 May 1969
Hungary	1 May 1967	4 January 1969
Iceland	13 March 1967	4 January 1969
India	3 December 1968	4 January 1969
Indonesia	25 June 1999[a]	25 July 1999
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 August 1968	4 January 1969
Iraq	14 January 1970	13 February 1970
Ireland	29 December 2000	27 January 2001
Israel	3 January 1979	2 February 1979
Italy	5 January 1976	4 February 1976
Jamaica	4 June 1971	4 July 1971
Japan	15 December 1995	14 January 1996

State party	*Date of receipt of the instrument of ratification or accession*	*Entry into force*
Jordan	30 May 1974[a]	29 June 1974
Kazakhstan	26 August 1998[a]	25 September 1998
Kenya	13 September 2001[a]	12 October 2001
Kuwait	15 October 1968[a]	4 January 1969
Kyrgyzstan	5 September 1997	5 October 1997
Lao People's Democratic Republic	22 February 1974[a]	24 March 1974
Latvia	14 April 1992[a]	14 May 1992
Lebanon	12 November 1971[c]	12 December 1971
Lesotho	4 November 1971[a]	4 December 1971
Liberia	5 November 1976[a]	5 December 1976
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 July 1968[a]	4 January 1969
Liechtenstein	1 March 2000[a]	31 March 2000
Lithuania	10 December 1998	9 January 1999
Luxembourg	1 May 1978	31 May 1978
Madagascar	7 February 1969	9 March 1969
Malawi	11 June 1996[a]	11 July 1996
Maldives	24 April 1984[a]	24 May 1984
Mali	16 July 1974[a]	15 August 1974
Malta	27 May 1971	26 June 1971
Mauritania	13 December 1988	12 January 1989
Mauritius	30 May 1972[a]	29 June 1972
Mexico	20 February 1975	22 March 1975
Monaco	27 September 1995	27 October 1995
Mongolia	6 August 1969	5 September 1969
Morocco	18 December 1970	17 January 1971
Mozambique	18 April 1983[a]	18 May 1983
Namibia	11 November 1982[a]	11 December 1982
Nepal	30 January 1971[a]	1 March 1971

State party	*Date of receipt of the instrument of ratification or accession*	*Entry into force*
Netherlands	10 December 1971	9 January 1972
New Zealand	22 November 1972	22 December 1972
Nicaragua	15 February 1978[a]	17 March 1978
Niger	27 April 1967	4 January 1969
Nigeria	16 October 1967[a]	4 January 1969
Norway	6 August 1970	5 September 1970
Pakistan	21 September 1966	4 January 1969
Panama	16 August 1967	4 January 1969
Papua New Guinea	27 January 1982[a]	26 February 1982
Peru	29 September 1971	29 October 1971
Philippines	15 September 1967	4 January 1969
Poland	5 December 1968	4 January 1969
Portugal	24 August 1982[a]	23 September 1982
Qatar	22 July 1976[a]	21 August 1976
Republic of Korea	5 December 1978[a]	4 January 1979
Republic of Moldova	26 January 1993[a]	25 February 1993
Romania	15 September 1970[a]	15 October 1970
Russian Federation	4 February 1969	6 March 1969
Rwanda	16 April 1975[a]	16 May 1975
Saint Lucia	14 February 1990[b]	16 March 1990
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	9 November 1981[a]	9 December 1981
San Marino	12 March 2002	10 April 2002
Saudi Arabia	22 September 1997	22 October 1997
Senegal	19 April 1972	19 May 1972
Seychelles	7 March 1978[a]	6 April 1978

State party	*Date of receipt of the instrument of ratification or accession*	*Entry into force*
Sierra Leone	2 August 1967	4 January 1969
Slovakia	28 May 1993[b]	28 May 1993
Slovenia	6 July 1992[b]	6 July 1992
Solomon Islands	17 March 1982[b]	16 April 1982
Somalia	26 August 1975	25 September 1975
South Africa	10 December 1998	9 January 1999
Spain	13 September 1968[a]	4 January 1969
Sri Lanka	18 February 1982[a]	20 March 1982
Sudan	21 March 1977[a]	20 April 1977
Suriname	15 March 1984[b]	14 April 1984
Swaziland	7 April 1969[a]	7 May 1969
Sweden	6 December 1971	5 January 1972
Switzerland	29 November 1994[a]	29 December 1994
Syrian Arab Republic	21 April 1969[a]	21 May 1969
Tajikistan	11 January 1995[a]	10 February 1995
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18 January 1994[b]	18 January 1994
Togo	1 September 1972[a]	1 October 1972
Tonga	16 February 1972[a]	17 March 1972
Trinidad and Tobago	4 October 1973	3 November 1973
Tunisia	13 January 1967	4 January 1969
Turkmenistan	29 September 1994[a]	29 October 1994
Uganda	21 November 1980[a]	21 December 1980
Ukraine	7 March 1969	6 April 1969
United Arab Emirates	20 June 1974[a]	20 July 1974
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 March 1969	6 April 1969

State party	*Date of receipt of the instrument of ratification or accession*	*Entry into force*
United Republic of Tanzania	27 October 1972[a]	26 November 1972
United States of America	21 October 1994	20 November 1994
Uruguay	30 August 1968	4 January 1969
Uzbekistan	28 September 1995[a]	28 October 1995
Venezuela	10 October 1967	4 January 1969
Viet Nam	9 June 1982[a]	9 July 1982
Yemen	18 October 1972[a]	17 November 1972
Yugoslavia	12 March 2001[b]	12 March 2001
Zambia	4 February 1972	5 March 1972
Zimbabwe	13 May 1991[a]	12 June 1991
Total: 162		

Note: The following States have signed but not ratified the Convention: Bhutan, Comoros, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Nauru, Paraguay, Sao Tome and Principe, Turkey.

[a] Accession.

[b] Date of receipt of notification of succession.

United Nations A/57/335

General Assembly

Distr.: General
22 August 2002

Original: English

Fifty-seventh session
Item 69 (a) of the provisional agenda*
Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters

Work of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters

Report of the Secretary-General**

Summary

The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters held its thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions in New York from 30 January to 1 February and in Geneva from 17 to 19 July 2002, respectively.

The Board focused its deliberations on: (a) weapons of mass destruction and terrorism, in particular nuclear safety and security, and the preparedness of the public health systems to deal with bioterrorism; (b) biological weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention; (c) implementation of the Programme of Action adopted at the 2001 United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects; (d) weaponization of outer space; and (e) disarmament and development.

The Board agreed that, in order to address seriously the threat of terrorism and the danger of the possible acquisition and use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists, it was imperative to strengthen and further develop a multilateral legal framework for arms control. The Board put forward a number of recommendations on preventing terrorist groups from developing, acquiring or using weapons of mass destruction, including the establishment of a governmental expert group to develop a comprehensive action plan to deal with nuclear terrorism. The Board emphasized the urgent need to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention, particularly in view of the dangers posed by potential bioterrorism. The Board welcomed the adoption of the

* A/57/150.

** The present report covers the results of the thirty-eighth (30 January-1 February) and the thirty-ninth (17-19 July) sessions of the Advisory Board in 2002.

02-53392 (E) 260902

Programme of Action at the 2001 United Nations Conference on Small Arms as an important first step taken by the international community to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and expressed its concern over the lack of norms banning the transfer of those weapons to non-State actors. The Board agreed to review its accomplishments and to discuss how to improve its functioning in 2003 on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of its establishment.

In its capacity as Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, the Board approved for submission to the General Assembly the report of the Director of the Institute on its activities from August 2001 to July 2002 and the programme of work and budget for 2003 (see A/57/302).

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–3	4
	A. Weapons of mass destruction and terrorism	4–25	4
	1. Prevention and enforcement	15–21	5
	(a) Nuclear weapons terrorism	16–18	5
	(b) Biological weapons terrorism	19–20	6
	(c) Chemical weapons terrorism	21	7
	2. Emergency response	22–25	7
	B. Biological weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention	26–32	7
	C. Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects	33–39	8
	D. Weaponization of outer space	40–41	8
	E. Disarmament and development	42–43	9
II.	Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research	44–49	9
III.	Disarmament Information Programme	50–52	9
IV.	Future work	53–55	10
Annex			
	Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters		11

I. Introduction

1. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters held its thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions in New York from 30 January to 1 February and in Geneva from 17 to 19 July 2002, respectively. The present report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 38/183 O of 20 December 1983. The report of the Board on its work as Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) has been presented in a separate document (A/57/302).

2. Arundhati Ghose of India chaired the two sessions of the Board in 2002.

3. The present report summarizes the Board's deliberations during the two sessions and the specific recommendations it conveyed to the Secretary-General.

A. Weapons of mass destruction and terrorism

4. At both of its sessions in 2002, the Board focused closely on a number of issues concerning threats from the possible development, acquisition and use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological weapons) by terrorists. Two specific issues appeared on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session of the Board: nuclear security and safety, and the preparedness of public health systems to deal with bioterrorism.

5. The Board agreed that a multilateral approach remained the only effective way of combating terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction and reiterated the need for respect for international law, including disarmament and arms control agreements on weapons of mass destruction. The Board underscored the important role that the existing arms control and disarmament agreements could play in preventing the development and acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by non-State groups, as States were obligated not to allow access to such weapons to unauthorized groups or persons. Therefore, promoting the universality of existing agreements such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention should be vigorously pursued. The Board recognized the need to engage non-parties to those agreements in dialogues and consultations aimed at cooperation among all States in preventing the possession or development by terrorist groups of weapons of mass destruction.

6. The Board recommended that the Department for Disarmament Affairs should undertake consultations with relevant international and regional organizations and should serve as a focal point in the efforts to deal with the terrorist threat with weapons of mass destruction, including the regular exchange of information among States and interested organizations.

7. At the thirty-eighth session, the Board discussed papers on the subject prepared by Vicente Berasategui and Pascal Boniface. The Board members put forward a number of specific proposals:

- As multilateral disarmament agreements envisage consultation and cooperation among the States parties, periodic consultations should be held to review the attempts by non-State groups to develop and acquire weapons of mass destruction and the actions taken by the States parties to react to them.
- The new Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee should coordinate all international efforts to prevent possible terrorist acquisition or development of weapons of mass destruction.
- The Secretary-General shall be entitled to resort to Article 99 of the Charter of the United Nations in case of terrorist activities leading to the development of weapons of mass destruction.
- The coverage of the existing database of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on illicit trafficking of nuclear materials should be made more comprehensive in order to better monitor proliferation and the terrorist threat posed by nuclear theft and illicit export.
- Given the vulnerability of civilian nuclear establishments to sabotage, quick action needs to be taken at both the national and the international level to redress the situation.
- In order to ensure prompt and effective assistance to those States under attack or threat of attack by terrorists with weapons of mass destruction, international mechanisms for mutual assistance in case of emergencies should be established or strengthened. This is of particular importance to weak States.
- The Conference on Disarmament should take up the issue of radiological weapons again, but from a new perspective — the potential threat of terrorist attack with such weapons.

- State sponsorship of the possible development, acquisition and use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists needs to be monitored carefully.

- Tactical nuclear weapons pose serious risks of diversion due to their small size and modes of forward basing, and merit enhanced safeguards and security.

8. At its thirty-ninth session, the Board continued its consideration of the issue, both in general and focusing on specific aspects, namely, nuclear security and safety, and the preparedness of public health systems to deal with bioterrorism. It heard useful briefings from the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Jayantha Dhanapala, on the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Policy Working Group on the United Nations and Terrorism, as well as activities undertaken by the Department for Disarmament Affairs in addressing the issue of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. The Board was also briefed by Dr. David Heymann, Executive Director for Communicable Diseases, World Health Organization (WHO), on the subject "Preparedness for the deliberate use of biological agents: a rational approach to the unthinkable". The Board also received discussion papers on the subject prepared by Harald Müller, William Potter and Kostyantyn Gryshchenko. The Board produced a number of findings and specific recommendations.

9. The Board stressed that the threat of terrorism with weapons of mass destruction was real. Currently, there were terrorist groups whose strategic calculus included mass fatalities as a legitimate means of achieving their goals. Materials and technologies to build weapons of mass destruction were generally accessible. Apart from weapons of mass destruction themselves, terrorist attacks on nuclear, biological and chemical facilities that would lead to the release of radioactivity, deadly biological agents or toxic chemicals were also a serious danger that must be addressed by the international community.

10. The Board found that, on the other hand, there were obstacles to the terrorists acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction, such as difficulties in obtaining access, technical expertise or problems in their employment, as well as health hazards. There were thus opportunities to deter or deflect terrorists from acquiring and using these weapons through enhancing obstacles to access and mitigating the impact of their use.

11. The Board agreed that coherence and a mutuality of interest were conducive to strengthening the international coalition for combating terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction. Maintaining, strengthening and further developing bilateral and multilateral arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements served to build confidence among States, reduce distrust and focus attention on the common security interest rather than divisive conflicts among states, thereby enhancing the opportunities for States to work together successfully in the fight against terrorism.

12. The Board defined two broad fields in which arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation instruments could be used to help combat terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction: prevention and enforcement, and mutual cooperation for emergency response.

13. The Board recommended that States parties to the various existing legal instruments use the review processes of those instruments to reaffirm their undertakings to take all necessary measures domestically to prevent unauthorized persons from obtaining weapons of mass destruction and the materials and technologies needed to manufacture them.

14. With regard to public information on terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction, a balance must be found between the drive, on the one hand, to issue a realistic assessment of the threat and convey ways to cope with it, and, on the other, to make a strong effort to avoid creating panic and to reassure the public that the Government is taking all necessary and possible measures to prevent the threat from arising, and to mitigate the consequences if it does.

1. Prevention and enforcement

15. Arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation measures that reduce or eliminate weapons of mass destruction and prevent or restrict access to materials, equipment and technologies related to those weapons are intrinsically useful for reducing the "points of access" and therefore make it harder for terrorists to obtain such weapons. Specific measures must be adapted to different situations vis-à-vis terrorism involving nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.

(a) Nuclear weapons terrorism

16. The Board identified four types of threats under nuclear terrorism:

(a) Attack on or sabotage of nuclear power installations;

(b) Matching highly radioactive materials with conventional explosives to create radiological dispersal devices ("dirty bombs");

(c) Theft or purchase of fissile material for the purpose of building and using a nuclear explosive device;

(d) Seizure and use of operational nuclear weapons.

17. Given the diversity of the threat and the multiple instruments to prevent it, the Board recommended that the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session should establish a governmental expert group to develop a comprehensive action plan to deal with nuclear terrorism. The Board saw a compelling need to assess the full range of nuclear terrorist threats and to invest limited financial and political resources where they could have the greatest impact. The comprehensive action plan should comprise a systematic comparison and assessment of different nuclear threats, an analysis of their probable occurrence and consequences, and knowledge of the susceptibility of those threats to preventive and remedial action.

18. The Board noted that the action plan approved by the IAEA Board of Governors in March 2002 was a significant, but incomplete, step towards that objective. The plan should include the following priority measures:

(a) Preventive measures such as tightened personal screening at nuclear power plants and the protection of high-consequence nuclear facilities from truck bomb attacks which could serve as "quick fixes" to deal with significant vulnerabilities while a longer-term action plan was under development;

(b) Measures to secure, consolidate and eliminate highly enriched uranium (HEU) in civilian uses by converting research reactors to run on low-enriched uranium (LEU) negotiating the repatriation of all Soviet-origin HEU from research facilities outside of the Russian Federation, down-blending existing stocks of HEU to LEU and agreeing not to introduce reactor types using HEU in the power reactor sectors, and undertaking efforts to replace HEU in non-explosive military uses;

(c) Measures to secure and reduce non-strategic nuclear weapons. These weapons are the most vulnerable to theft by unauthorized persons and, for those lacking sufficient technical safeguards, the most prone to be used. The United States of America and the Russian Federation should be encouraged to reaffirm in a joint statement their continued commitment to the 1991-1992 parallel unilateral declarations to reduce and consolidate stocks of non-strategic nuclear weapons. In addition or alternatively, the United States Cooperative Threat Reduction Initiative could be utilized as a vehicle for safeguarding non-strategic nuclear weapons and enhancing their transparency;

(d) Negotiation of additional legal instruments or the amendment of existing ones:

- The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material should be made applicable to civilian nuclear material in domestic use, storage and transport with a view to making protection for that material comparable to that recommended in the IAEA non-binding guideline INFCIRC 225/Rev.4. Parties should be requested to report to IAEA on the adoption of measures undertaken to bring national regulations into conformity with the amendment. In that context, States should agree to apply the strictest measures of physical security to the long-range maritime transport of spent fuel or fissile material in cooperation, as appropriate, with the coastal States concerned;
- In order to create an effective instrument of enforcement, efforts should be renewed to complete negotiations on the draft Convention on the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, based on the draft text submitted by the Russian Federation;
- Consideration of resuming negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a convention for the prohibition of radiological weapons in which States would undertake measures for securing material for such weapons and preventing unauthorized access to such material.

(b) Biological weapons terrorism

19. The Board noted that while the Biological Weapons Convention had not been negotiated from the perspective of fighting against terrorism, it nevertheless contained, like the other multilateral instruments on weapons of mass destruction, an obligation of States to prevent unauthorized access to deadly biological agents. The Board thus considered

that efforts to strengthen the Convention regime were also conducive to combating bioterrorism.

20. The Board considered that the following measures would be useful in that regard:

(a) Penalizing, in national legislation and in international criminal law, the abuse of biotechnology for terrorist purposes, including activities running counter to the provisions of the Biological Weapons Convention, and strictly enforcing such laws;

(b) Developing national capabilities of detection and investigation by strengthening international cooperation between intelligence communities and law enforcement agencies, at the bilateral and the multilateral levels;

(c) Promoting bilateral and multilateral cooperation and assistance in the field of non-proliferation aimed at reducing the biological weapons threat;

(d) Enhancing international cooperation at the multilateral level to prevent illegal trafficking of biological agents and equipment that can be used for terrorist purposes.

(c) Chemical weapons terrorism

21. In contrast to the threat of nuclear and biological terrorism, the chemical weapons threat was not discussed by the Board with equal depth. Measures which the Board deemed useful were:

(a) Reaffirming the undertaking by the States parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention to prevent unauthorized access to chemical warfare agents and precursor substances;

(b) Providing full physical security to chemical weapons agents in storage prior to their destruction, as well as for the destruction facilities.

2. Emergency response

22. The Board strongly recommended that the States parties to the respective international agreements concerning disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction agree to provide mutual assistance in case of emergencies as an obligation, such as explicitly expressed in article X of the Chemical Weapons Convention, and to make the necessary preparations to render such assistance in a prompt and effective manner.

23. The Board noted that partial responses had been provided for in the nuclear area in the 1986 Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency, and in the biological area in the WHO Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network and in resolution WHA55.16, adopted by the World Health Assembly on 18 May 2002.

24. The Board recommended that States consider and prepare measures for mutual assistance in the following areas:

(a) Locating weapons of mass destruction and rendering them harmless;

(b) Hot pursuit, fighting and detaining of terrorists that have or might have weapons of mass destruction;

(c) Forensic assistance in tracing the origins of weapons of mass destruction or their materials;

(d) Medical assistance;

(e) Decontamination;

(f) Financial assistance.

25. The Board considered that cooperative measures for emergency response were particularly urgent in the biological weapons field. They included:

(a) Preparation of societies, notably their public health systems, for the early detection of diseases (provision of disease surveillance systems, sufficient diagnostic equipment, education of alert health workers and doctors) and rapid response to the outbreak of diseases caused by bioterrorist attacks (vaccination, stockpiles of medicine for effective disease treatment);

(b) Establishment of an international vaccine bank with the necessary communication, transport and personal infrastructure to make an immediate impact at the point of attack.

B. Biological weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention

26. The Board heard briefings by Tibor Toth, President of the Fifth Review Conference of States Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention, and other experts on developments during the Review Conference and on prospects for the resumed session of the Conference scheduled for November 2002.

27. The Board regretted that the Ad Hoc Group of States Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention had failed to conclude a protocol aimed at strengthening the Convention and that the Fifth Review Conference had also been unable to renew the Group's mandate, thus leading to the adjournment of the Conference.

28. The Board agreed that, despite the setbacks, the Convention should nevertheless be strengthened, particularly in view of the dangers posed by potential bioterrorism. That process should include agreement on a protocol, which had been under negotiation in Geneva for several years. All States parties to the Convention should participate in that process.

29. The Board further agreed that the outcome of the previous Biological Weapons Convention review conferences should continue to be implemented. As 90 per cent of the elements in the draft final declaration of the suspended Fifth Review Conference had already been agreed upon, the Board further supported the view that the draft final declaration should not be lost, but rather preserved for future finalization.

30. The Board examined a number of ways to carry on the work so far achieved aiming at strengthening the Convention. In that connection, the Board noted that article V of the Convention provided the framework for consultation and it discussed and explored a number of approaches to achieve that objective, among them, that:

(a) The Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, could assist the process by convening consultations among the States parties and undertaking public campaigns. This could include holding seminars and workshops to prepare for the resumed session of the Fifth Review Conference;

(b) The President and/or the Bureau of the Fifth Review Conference could undertake consultations on monitoring the implementation of the outcome of the previous Review Conference.

31. The Board noted the importance of engaging the bio-industry in the process.

32. The Board also noted that there was a new awareness of the inadequacies of the public health systems to deal with bioterrorism and that such an awareness created opportunities to enhance public health services while simultaneously addressing new threats in the sphere of bioterrorism.

C. Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects

33. The Board received several discussion papers on regional perspectives on the subject from Mariama Bayard Gamatié, Jill Sinclair and Gelson Fonseca, Jr., respectively. The Board was briefed on the outcome of the Tokyo Follow-up Meeting to the 2001 United Nations Conference.

34. The Board welcomed the adoption of the Programme of Action at the 2001 United Nations Conference as an important first step taken by the international community to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

35. The Board discussed specific initiatives on the implementation of the Programme of Action at the national, regional and international levels.

36. The Board focused its discussion on several issues, such as the ban on transferring small arms and light weapons to non-State actors, domestic control of civilian possession of such weapons, strengthening of national export control systems, promoting a culture of peace, etc.

37. The issue of the prohibition of the transfer of such weapons to non-State actors figured prominently in the discussion. The Board expressed its deep concern over the lack of norms prohibiting the transfer of those weapons to non-State actors, especially in Africa.

38. The Board agreed that the United Nations should play an important role in strengthening the capacity of civil society to combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

39. It further agreed that the United Nations could play a crucial role in mobilizing public opinion, in encouraging and assisting States in drafting legislation, in training, in promoting the exchange of regional and national experiences, in collecting, collating and disseminating information related to combating the illicit trade in these weapons, and in forging global norms to apply in local situations.

D. Weaponization of outer space

40. The Board discussed the paper by Raimundo González on the subject. Some members also referred

to a joint paper submitted to the Conference on Disarmament on 28 June 2002 by several delegations on the subject (CD/1679).

41. The Board regretted the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to start substantive work on the subject. It agreed that there was a need to strengthen coordination and cooperation between the Conference on Disarmament and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space in addressing issues related to the subject.

E. Disarmament and development

42. Several members, recalling the action programme adopted at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1987, expressed the concern that this important issue had been marginalized in recent years due to a lack of interest by some States. They emphasized that the question was of particular significance to developing countries, where much-needed resources for socio-economic development had been continuously diverted to armaments.

43. The Board noted the complexity of the issue, as it involved peace, security and development. The Board discussed the paper prepared by Mariama Bayard Gamatié on the subject. It agreed to revisit the important topic at its fortieth session in early 2003.

II. Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

44. At the thirty-eighth session, the Board heard the oral report of the Director of UNIDIR on the programme of work and budget of the Institute for 2002 and on its consideration by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee at the fifty-sixth session of the General Assembly. The Board formally adopted the 2002 programme budget for UNIDIR.

45. The Board expressed its satisfaction that the work of UNIDIR was going from strength to strength and called for greater support of its useful work by Member States. The Board recommended that the necessary resources should be allocated within the Secretariat to translate some of the UNIDIR publications into the other official languages of the United Nations, especially the recently published *Coming to Terms with Security: Lexicon for Arms Control, Disarmament and Confidence-Building*, which was considered especially useful as an educational tool and would be of even greater value if it were available in all United Nations languages.

46. At its thirty-ninth session, the Board heard the report of the Director of UNIDIR on the activities of the Institute during the period August 2001 to July 2002 and the planned activities for 2003 and beyond, as well as on its programme of work.

47. The Board was pleased to note that the Budget Office had applied cost adjustments to the subvention for the Institute for 2002 and 2003. It expressed satisfaction that resources had been allocated within the Secretariat for the translation into Arabic of some of the UNIDIR publications, including *Coming to Terms with Security: Lexicon for Arms Control, Disarmament and Confidence-Building* and the forthcoming *Coming to Terms with Security: A Handbook on Verification and Compliance*. It expressed the hope that the level of support to UNIDIR would be maintained and also reiterated its strong support for an increase in the real value of the subvention to UNIDIR.

48. Several members of the Board expressed the view that the functioning of the Board of Trustees should be improved and it was agreed that the issue should be reviewed in conjunction with the review of the work and functioning of the Advisory Board as a whole at its next session.

49. At its thirty-ninth session, pursuant to article III, paragraph 2 (b), of the statute of the Institute, the Board approved, for submission to the General Assembly, the programme of work and budget of the Institute for 2003 (see A/56/302).

III. Disarmament Information Programme

50. The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Jayantha Dhanapala, briefed the Board at its thirty-eighth session on the activities of the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme.

51. At its 39th session, the Board was briefed on the progress on the draft United Nations study on

disarmament and non-proliferation education that the Group of Government Experts was to submit to the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 55/33 E of 20 November 2000. The Board considered education and training to be an important yet underutilized approach to the promotion of disarmament and non-proliferation. It recommended that the findings of the study be given the widest distribution possible.

52. The Board heard presentations from representatives of several NGOs during both of its 2002 sessions. At the thirty-eighth session, the Board was briefed by Loretta Bondi of The Fund for Peace on issues related to small arms and light weapons and by John Burroughs of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security on the subject of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. Ms. Bondi urged States and the United Nations to start negotiation on an international legal instrument on the tracing and marking of small arms and light weapons. Mr. Burroughs stressed that the elimination of nuclear weapons was the only effective way to prevent nuclear terrorism. At its thirty-ninth session, the Board heard presentations by Aaron Tovish of Parliamentarians for Global Action and Pablo Celi de la Torre from Central University of Ecuador, on weapons of mass destruction and terrorism, and disarmament and development respectively. Mr. Tovish made the point that the threat of terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction had not necessarily increased because of the 11 September terrorist attacks in the United States. Mr. Celi de la Torre emphasized that the experience of Latin American countries showed that transparency in military spending could contribute to confidence-building and promoting trust among States, and thus was conducive to curbing the diversion of resources to military uses.

IV. Future work

53. The year 2003 marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Board. The Board felt that it was necessary to use the occasion to have a general review of its accomplishments over the years, as well as a discussion on how to improve its functioning in the future.

54. The Board proposed to include the following items in the agenda of its fortieth session:

(a) Review of the functioning and effectiveness of the Board;

(b) Open-source data for promoting disarmament;

(c) Continuation of the consideration of disarmament and development.

55. The Board agreed that the issue of rising military expenditures would be considered at its forty-first session.

Annex

Members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters

Arundhati Ghose (Chairperson)[a,b]
Ambassador
Member, Union Public Service Commission
New Delhi

Mariama Bayard Gamatié[a,b]
Consultant on development and gender issues
Niamey

Vicente Berasategui[a,b]
Ambassador of the Argentine Republic to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
London

Pascal Boniface[a,b]
Director
Institute of International and Strategic Relations
Paris

Rolf Ekéus[a]
High Commissioner on National Minorities
Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
The Hague

Nabil Fahmy[a]
Ambassador of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United States of America
Washington, D.C.

Shai Feldman[a,b]
Head
The Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv

Gelson Fonseca, Jr.[a]
Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations
New York

Raimundo González[a,b]
Ambassador of Chile to Austria
Vienna

Kostyantyn Gryshchenko[a,b]
Ambassador of Ukraine to the United States
Washington, D.C.

Hu Xiaodi[a,b]
Ambassador of China for Disarmament Affairs
Geneva

Maleeha Lodhi[a]
Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States
Washington, D.C.

Miguel Marín Bosch[a,b]
Under-Secretary for Asia, Africa, Europe and Multilateral Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mexico City

Abdul S. Minty
Acting Director General:
Department of Foreign Affairs
Pretoria

Harald Müller[a,b]
Director
Peace Research Institute Frankfurt
Frankfurt, Germany

William Potter[a,b]
Director
Center for Nonproliferation Studies and Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Monterey, CA, United States

Boris Pyadyshev[a,b]
Ambassador
Editor-in-Chief, *International Affairs*
Moscow

Jane Sharp[a,b]
Senior Research Fellow
Centre for Defence Studies
Kings College
London

Jill Sinclair
Director General
International Security Bureau
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
Ottawa

Kongit Sinegiorgis[b]
Director-General for African Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Addis Ababa

Yoshitomo Tanaka[a,b]
Ambassador
President, Radio Press, Inc.
Tokyo

Nugroho Wisnumurti[a,b]
Permanent Representative of the Republic
of Indonesia to the United Nations and other
International Organizations
Geneva

Patricia Lewis (ex officio member)[a,b]
Director of the United Nations Institute for
Disarmament Research
Geneva

Notes

[a] Participated in the thirty-eighth session.

[b] Participated in the thirty-ninth session.